

Maritime Code

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the said motions will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the yeas have it. Do the motions carry?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motions Nos. 1 and 5 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now proceed to motion No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) and motion No. 3 in the name of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro).

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, these motions have already been formally moved. We are now starting to get into the meat of the content of Bill C-61, the Maritime Code. We are still dealing with clause 8 with regard to the coastal ports of Canada. My two colleagues have in a general way pointed out some of the fears we on this side have with respect to it.

The amendment I put forward seeks to strengthen the intent and spirit of the act as it relates to cabotage. What we have been attempting to do since we lost the Canadian merchant marine through what can only be described as carelessness by Liberal administrations of 15 or 20 years ago is to re-establish a framework for a Canadian merchant marine.

This House has heard me talk about the role of Canada in the north, for example, that we should be the ones to control our extractive industries, build the boats, find the crews, and provide the technology and planning. My amendment seeks to close one of the major loopholes in the bill. Fears have been expressed by my colleagues from the west. My colleagues from the east will be a little less restrained than those two hon. gentlemen and will put in a forceful manner some of the fears we have.

For those who have bothered to read my amendment it is not put forward with tongue in cheek. I will read it because I am sure most members have not bothered to look at it. I am attempting to close a very serious loophole in the act. If we pass this bill without giving consideration to and doing some thing about this, we might just as well not have bothered in the first place. I have moved the deletion of line 20 at page 12 and the substitution of the following therefor, and I quote:

"Canada: and, for better ensuring the attainment of the said purposes, any port or place in the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon shall be deemed to be a port or place in Canada, and the Governor in Council may, by order, provide that any other port or place not in Canada shall be deemed to be in Canada."

[Mr. Paproski.]

We are trying to get at closing the damnable practice of foreign ships coming into our country and engaging in business that could well be carried on by Canadian entrepreneurs. This is not being done by Canadians because parliament will not give them a change to invest in developing a tourist industry.

As an example, Russian ships enter the port of Montreal and take on passengers who have paid \$300, \$400 or \$500 for a trip. The ship flies a foreign flag. There is a foreign crew. They are not subject to the Canada Labour Code, the Immigration Act, the Income Tax Act, or any other Canadian Laws. We permit them to come here, pick up passengers, steam down the St. Lawrence, up the Saguenay and get off at Quebec. They can clear the Saguenay or Diamond Point at St. Pierre and Miquelon, a foreign place. It does not matter whether they go into that port. They simply have to clear "foreign" and then return to drop off their passengers. They can do so at rates the Canadian industry cannot afford. It is to correct this that we have introduced this amendment. I see it is ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker. I will resume when this matter is next before the House.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION—ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN ITEM IN ESTIMATES AND IN PAMPHLET "HOW YOUR TAX DOLLAR IS SPENT"

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 26, I endeavoured to ask a question of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) respecting the veracity of a statement contained in the document "How Your Tax Dollar is Spent" which was tabled by the minister at the time he tabled the main estimates for 1976-77.

I feel that I must have worded the question badly since the Chair ruled that it ought to be put to the minister when he is before the standing committee. Certainly any questions dealing with spending by the Treasury Board should be put to the President of the Treasury Board in committee. And of course any questions dealing with the details of spending in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources should be put to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) in committee.

However, the question I had was not with regard to the estimates or the spending by these departments, but rather with regard to a statement in the pamphlet "How Your Tax Dollar is Spent". In particular, on page 24 of this pamphlet in the final paragraph, indeed the final sentence of the section describing Energy, Mines and Resources, there is the statement, and I quote: